

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 3 and 7 to 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Loffler et al. (US 6,748,860). Claims 2, 4 to 6 and 13 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Loffler et al. in view of Isogawa et al. (JP 10,307,731).

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

#### **35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections**

Claims 1, 3 and 7 to 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Loffler et al. (US 6,748,860).

Loffler discloses a color screen with two image areas 10 and 11. The window 10 displays a printing image 12.1. The image in the window 10 is an actual printing image 12.1 produced electronically on the color screen 3 (See col. 4, lines 55 to 60). It is assumed that the asserted device in Loffler to meet the claim limitation thus is color screen 3 although the Office Action fails to so specify.

Claim 1 recites “a device graphically superimposing, on physically-existing printing material printed by the printing material processing machine, data to be displayed.”

Loffler does not have a device capable of superimposing any data at all. The screen 3 of Loffler produces solely an electronic image, and no superimposing occurs as the image is viewed directly. Nor would it have been obvious to so modify Loffler to provide a graphical superimposing device, as Loffler specifically desires an electronic image on screen 3.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 3 and 7 to 12 for these reasons is respectfully requested.

With further respect to claim 8, it is not understood which separate device of Loffler is being referred to. Loffler clearly does not have both “a device graphically superimposing, on physically-existing printing material printed by the printing material processing machine, data to be displayed” and “a display device for graphically displaying the printing material and for graphically superimposing the data to be displayed on the graphical display of the printing material” as claimed and the Office Action again refuses to specify elements of Loffler which meet the limitations.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1, 3 and 7 to 12 is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. 103 Rejections

Claims 2, 4 to 6, and 13 to 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Loffler et al. in view of Isogawa et al. (JP 10,307,731).


Isogawa also does not teach superimposing any data on a printed material, but rather on a screen. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the motivation provided (“to project a clear and concise image on a screen”) is not taught by Isogawa. There also is no desire in Loffler for an image to be “concise” and the use of direct screens such as LCDs typically provides in any event much higher resolution and clarity than projectors. If a clear image on a screen is desired, one of skill in the art would have stuck with the display of Loffler.

Withdrawal of the rejections to claims 2 and 4 to 6 is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

The present application is respectfully submitted as being in condition for allowance and applicants respectfully request such action.

Respectfully submitted,  
DAVIDSON, DAVIDSON & KAPPEL, LLC

By:   
William C. Gehris  
Reg. No. 38,156

Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
485 Seventh Avenue  
New York, New York 10018  
(212) 736-1940